

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 8, stating that it is unclear if the variables within and outside of parenthesis are intended to be claim limitations. The variable identifiers are merely a notational convenience for simplifying the claim language. Applicant's representatives have removed the parentheses from initial occurrences of the variables and replaced them with commas.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1 and 8 stating that the claims contain variables which have not been defined. Applicant's representatives traverse the Examiner's rejection here. Each variable is believed to be clearly defined. The variable "E" represents each one of the "plurality of evaluators" for reciting a limitation that applies to each of the evaluators. In particular, a limitation for each instantiation of the variable E as one of the evaluators is that the step of determining determines "the corresponding curing predictive effectiveness according to a correlation between (a1) and (a2) following:

- (a1) outputs by the evaluator E, wherein for each curing condition, CC_j, of the curing conditions, there is a portion of the outputs obtained when the evaluator E is provided with a sequence of impedance responses from a device, the sequence of impedance responses being indicative of impedance measurements of the at least one part at its the curing condition CC_j; and in curing equipment that is also to be used in curing a subsequent part, and
- (a2) for each curing condition, CC_k, of the curing conditions, a curing time obtained from curing a curable compound at the curing condition CC_k, wherein the curable compound is expected to have a corresponding composition to the at least one part cured at the curing condition CC_k".

In particular, the claim structure regarding the variable E is similar to stating, for a claim directed to a chair, that for each leg, L, of a chair, the leg L is cylindrical.

It is believed that the meaning of the other variables in Claims 1 and 8 are also clear. For example, regarding the variable, CC_j, for each evaluator, E, there is a “plurality curing conditions”, and the limitation at (a1) recites that “for each curing condition, CC_j, of the of curing conditions, ...”. Such conventions for simplifying claim language are believed to appropriate and conventional.

The Examiner further rejects Claim 1 due to the term “the curing evaluators” stating that there is no antecedent basis. This term has been changed to “the evaluators” which has antecedent basis.

The Examiner rejects Claim 1 due to the term “the predictive effectiveness for E_i” stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. Applicant’s representatives respectfully traverse the present rejection. The step of determining in Claim 1 recites a “curing predictive effectiveness” determined for each evaluator. Accordingly, the term “the predictive effectiveness for E_i” has an antecedent basis since E_i is clearly identified as an evaluator. Thus, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 stating that the term “said particular frequency” has insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 4 is now dependent on Claim 3, and accordingly this term has proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 stating that the term “approximately” is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term “approximately” has been removed from Claim 4.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 stating that the limitation “the rubber component RC of (a1) for CC” has insufficient antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that the present limitation has proper antecedent basis. However, Claim 8 has been amended since Claim 1 has been broadened to recite a “curable compound” instead of a “rubber compound”. Accordingly, since Claim 1 recites that there is “at least one part” cured at each of the curing conditions (in the “wherein” clause following the “determining” step), and since Claim 1 also recites in (a2) that for each curing condition there is “a curing compound” cured at the curing condition, it is believed that there is proper antecedent bases for all limitations of Claim 8.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 9 stating that the term “substantially” is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. This term has been removed from the claim.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 19-20 stating that the term “substantially” is a relative term. The term has been removed from these claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 21 stating that the term “the rubber” has insufficient antecedent bases. This term has been removed from the claim.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 23 stating that the term “the segments” insufficient antecedent bases. The present claim is now dependent on Claim 22, and accordingly there is proper antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,773,021 to Harris (Harris herein).

Regarding Claim 1, this claim has been amended, and is believed to be now allowable over Harris. The Examiner apparently identifies each of the plurality of evaluators recited in Claim 1 with performing a variation of Harris’ conductivity model (e.g., Harris’ equation 2). In particular, a first variation of this conductivity model uses an adjustment of the estimated activation energy E output by step 57 of Harris’ Fig. 6, and a second variation of Harris’ conductivity model uses an adjustment of the estimated cure constant C output by step 58 of Harris’ Fig. 6. However, Claim 1 now recites: determining, for each evaluator, its “corresponding predictive effectiveness according to a correlation between” outputs by the evaluator, and particular curing times. No such correlation is taught or suggested in Harris. Note that Harris fits “measurements of the dielectric sensor” to his conductivity model to predict the time of a resin conductivity maximum, but such a data fitting process does not produce a predictive effectiveness value that is used in curing a *subsequent* part as now recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that amended Claim 1 allowable.

Since Claim 1 is allowable, and Claims 2-30 are dependent on Claim 1, it is believed that Claims 2-30 are now allowable.

New Claims

New Claims 31 and 32 are provided herewith. Claim 31 is believed allowable over Harris for similar reasoning as provided above for Claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that Claim 31 is allowable.

Claim 32 is allowable at least due to its dependence on Claim 32.

Since all claims are now allowable, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider the present application and promptly allow it to proceed to issuance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the present application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by phone.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: /Dennis J. Dupray/

Dennis J. Dupray
Registration No. 46,299
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: Dec. 26, 2006